



**UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
MARINE CORPS SYSTEMS COMMAND
2200 LESTER STREET
QUANTICO, VIRGINIA 22134-5010**

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5720

LAWQ

MCSC2014F00013

11 Feb 14

Ms. Alison L. Schuettler
Harris IT Services Corporation
21000 Atlantic Blvd., Suite 300
Dulles VA 20166

SUBJECT: FOIA MCSC2014F00013

Dear Ms. Schuettler:

This responds to your FOIA request dated October 25, 2013, for a copy of "debrief information relating to Solicitation M67854-13-Q-9002. Specifically, Harris IT Services is seeking comments pertaining to the strengths and weakness of each section the Technical/Management Volumes of its proposal."

The requested document(s) are enclosed.

Fees associated with processing your request are minimal and waived.

If at any time you are not satisfied that a diligent effort was made to process your request, you may file an administrative appeal with the Assistant to the General Counsel (FOIA) at:

Department of the Navy
Office of the General Counsel
ATTN: FOIA Appeals Office
1000 Navy Pentagon Room 4E635
Washington DC 20350-1000

For consideration, the appeal must be received in that office within 60 days from the date of this letter. Attach a copy of this letter and a statement regarding why you believe an adequate search was not conducted. Both your appeal letter and the envelope should bear the notation "FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT APPEAL". Please provide a copy of any such appeal letter to the MARCORSYSCOM address above.

Any questions concerning this matter should be directed to Mrs. Bobbie Cave at (703) 432-3934 or bobbie.cave@usmc.mil.

Sincerely,

Bobbie Cave
for LISA L. BAKER
Counsel

Factor 1: Technical Approach

Technical Approach Rating: Marginal

Technical Approach Risk Rating: Moderate

Technical Approach Summary

The offeror's technical approach includes strengths in some areas where they have a good plan that would be of benefit to the government. However, significant weakness and deficiencies were identified such as the absence of experience supporting the CorasWorks third party tool, which is a critical tool used extensively by several HQMC customers, that is specified in SOW Section 3.1.3.3 paragraph 3 as a tool of "specific emphasis" for on-site support; and the tools utilized to provide CAC authentication to all ARI hosted applications (Microsoft ISA and TMG). Microsoft ISA and TMG are listed in SOW Section 3.3.2, which includes the "tools the contractor will use to support HQMC applications." While this lack of experience would not preclude the contractor from completing all aspects of the requirement, it would preclude the contractor from supporting these are two required tools. This increases the risk of unsuccessful performance of the contract. The weaknesses numerically outweigh the strengths, and the limited number of strengths does not offset the weaknesses due to the critical areas where they are weak. The offeror cannot provide the requirements of the SOW without significant skill and experience in these tools.

Section 1. Technical Approach including Deliverables

Part 1 Section 1 Line 49 Page 1-2

Note

The offeror demonstrated the ability to mitigate any possible gaps in staffing. During periods of temporary vacancies, the Harris Team states that they will leverage staff from Harris's Corporate network of 15,000 employees and its subcontractor partners thus mitigating gaps in staffing for the HQMC IT FSS program. This will minimize interruptions in service when someone on the contract is unavailable.

Part 1 Section 1 Lines 237-236 Page 1-7

Note

The offeror states that they will enter Information Assurance Vulnerability Alerts (IAVAs) requiring action within the CM Log (as Priority-Critical with the concurrence of the PM) to ensure compliance with applicable security directives. The Software Development Process identified for HQMC IT FSS also includes a number of Deliverables and Reviews that require careful documentation prep and release control. The quality of these documents will be the primary responsibilities of the Harris PM. All approved and delivered configuration information will be shared on a HQMC IT FSS SharePoint site. This will assist the government in maintaining Information Assurance compliance of supported systems.

Part 1.2.2 Section 1 Lines 402-421

Note

HQMC IT FSS Evaluation Summary: Harris

The offeror states that the developers will work closely with the client to define, develop, integrate, test and deploy systems and applications as directed, to include functional or operational changes. This is of note because its overall process through the creation and careful maintenance of a detailed, numerical record of all SCRs.

Part 1 Section 1.2.3 Lines 594-602 Page 1-5

Significant Weakness

The offeror proposal did not identify any knowledge or experience with development using the CorasWorks toolset. There are many HQMC sites that extensively utilize the CorasWorks products. Lack of knowledge and experience using this third party toolset has potential to impact custom developed systems that utilize CorasWorks which is a requirement per SOW section 3.2.2. The impact could vary from taking longer to complete a trouble call due to lack of experience to having indefinite loss of functionality for complex applications built using this tool. There are far too many applications utilizing CorasWorks to list, but some of the high volume applications using this tool are: ARHelp Request for Services System, HQMC Training Registration, and the ESSRP Check-in/out application. Downtime in these and several other applications cause the customer and functional area to revert back to a more time consuming manual process. Additionally, the contractor would not be able to complete requests for new applications whereby CorasWorks is needed to meet the requirements.

Part 1 Section 1.3.1 Line 652 Page 1-6

Note

The offeror states that they will provide documentation for all customer support requests in Remedy as required. They will keep customers informed of the progress of their issues as they are being worked. It is also required to use the internal SharePoint ticketing system.

Part 1 Section 2.0 Lines 675-678 Page 1-17

Note

Offeror states that they will ensure MCATS continuity by conducting user training as required from the Government and cross-training for Government IT Instructors to facilitate collaboration. The MCATS SME will have the knowledge to develop extensive lesson plans to be used by government trainers and will support those trainers as needed to ensure end users have an excellent learning experience and emerge from training fully versed in the current and future uses of the MCATS database and its interfaces.

Section 2. Software Development Plan (SDP)

The offeror met the requirement to provide a Software Development Plan which indicates they have knowledge in the development, planning, testing, installation versioning, configuration control, and correcting software and software products.

Section 3. CMMI Maturity Level III Process Model or Equivalent

The offeror met the requirement of the SOW by showing that they are CMMI Level III certified in their proposal.

Section 4. Operations and Support Plan

Part 4 Section 1.2.1 Line 23 Page 4-1

Deficiency

The offeror states that they will provide the first draft of the project plan within 30 calendar days of award and will update it quarterly. Per the SOW 3.1.1.1, and the deliverables table at the end of section 3.1, the awardee must provide an internal Project Plan 1 week After Contract Award (ACA). This lengthy delay increases performance risk to an unacceptable level.

Part 4 Section 1.5 Lines 105-112 Page 4-3

Weakness

The quotation demonstrates that they do not understand what MCATS is and how it is used. The following quote illustrates their lack of understanding, “As part of the documentation process, we make certain that key discussion points and all decisions are recorded in meeting minutes and reflected in the CM system. Action items will be recorded and we will ensure that they are entered into Marine Corps Action Tracking System (MCATS) by the MCATS SME.” MCATS is a tasker management system that is not used for the purpose they cite. MCATS acts basically as an electronic route sheet for data calls, and to track documents while they are in the development and approval phase. It allows documents to be uploaded and reviewed for editing or concurrence by the agencies. MCATS is an agency level tool, which was not designed to assign tasks at any lower level without special modification that would disconnect the sub-task from the original task. Therefore, MCATS is an ineffective tool for assigning and tracking internal action items.

Part 4 Section 1.8 Line 270 Page 4-7

Note

The offeror is trained and experienced in both computer-based and instructor-based training. This will allow HQMC to assist and expand the knowledge of its customer base both on and off site. This will also minimize training and travel costs for supported commands.

Part 4 Section 1.8 Lines 288-291 Page 4-8

Strength

The offeror has experience developing the MCSC VIPER SharePoint training, which can be leveraged to offer a blended SharePoint training solution that pairs structured basic orientation with just-in-time training. This capability can be integrated within the HQMC ARI SharePoint environment and will enhance or augment classroom training.

Part 4

Weakness

The offeror did not indicate any experience with Microsoft Information Security Accelerator (ISA) and Threat Management Gateway (TMG). This is of detriment to the government because all ARI hosted systems utilize one of these services to authenticate users. Without support of these services the contractor will not be able to support ARI with troubleshooting problems or adding new applications, which must be CAC enabled to meet regulatory requirements, and requirements of the SOW. If the service is interrupted no one would be able to access any applications until resolved. This requirement was not mentioned anywhere within their proposal, as required by multiple areas of the SOW (see SOW, 3.2.1, Item #4, where managing authentication using ISA and TMG is listed as a current routine task; the list in Section 3.2.2; Section 3.2.4, Paragraph 3 where these are described as one of the “associated tools”; and Section 3.2.4, Item #3 whereby the contractor is required to architect and implement authentication for applications).

Factor 2: Management Approach

Management Approach Rating: Marginal

Management Approach Risk Rating: Moderate

Management Approach Summary

The offeror’s quotation included one project they successfully completed which was very similar to the Lotus Notes migration ARI will be undertaking in the next year or so. This experience would be of significant benefit to the government due to the complexity of the project. However, the Project Staffing Plan is significantly flawed. The hours they identify for Microsoft SQL maintenance are inadequate to properly support a SharePoint farm the magnitude of eHQMC. Per the SOW requirement 3.2.2, eHQMC contains 12,567 SharePoint sites and 4TB active data. It additionally consists of three separate environments (staging, production, and COOP). From past experience the number of hours projected are inadequate to properly optimize and maintain the server farm. Two of the most critical positions are on contingent offers, and only two of the six full time employees proposed are 8570 certified, which is a requirement of the statement of work and is required before they could perform their duties. The offeror’s plan introduces significant risks that they will not have a team in place at task order award with the skill or certifications necessary to carry out the requirement of the SOW, nor that they have allocated proper resources to perform critical tasks.

Section 1. Management and Organization Structure

Part 2 Section 1.1.2.1 Lines 80-84 Page 1-3

Strength

The offeror completed a major project to replace Lotus Notes based Knowledge Management System based on SharePoint as a replacement architecture and were tasked to design, implement, and deploy the replacement system. The project was successfully completed resulting in a deployed system to the Marine Corps Enterprise IT System (MCEITS), which enhanced maintenance, and service desk support. There is no indication that the same technicians will be used on this contract, but the ability to reach back and/or apply lessons learned could be beneficial because it is a similar project, per section 1.0 of the SOW.

Section 2. Project Staffing Plan

Part 2 Section 2.4 Table 2.4-1 Page 2.9

Deficiency

The offeror only proposes 160 labor hours for SQL Server Database Admin. Additionally they only identify 120 hours for MCATS maintenance. Further, hours identified and several columns in the table do not add up correctly. Past experience has shown that the number of labor hours proposed is insufficient to properly execute the SQL Server maintenance on a server farm the size of eHQMC. Per the SOW requirement 3.2.2, eHQMC contains 12,567 SharePoint sites and 4TB active data. It additionally consists of three separate environments (staging, production, and COOP). From past experience the number of hours projected is inadequate to properly optimize and maintain the server farm. The offeror proposes approximately 13 hours per month for database administration. Without very expensive monitoring tools in place we average about 12 hours per *week* for capacity management, performance tuning, patching, backups. That does not include routine monitoring, troubleshooting, problem resolution, or building new databases or features. This insufficient estimate of hours demonstrates that the offeror does not understand the scope of the work involved and increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

Part 2 Section 2.5.1 Lines 273-275 Page 2-10

Weakness

The offeror states that the two Information Systems Technicians are contingent hires. However, the intent will be to staff all personnel on day one of the contract to ensure a smooth transition from the incumbent and mitigate transition risk. If they do not have these positions filled on day one it will be impossible to meet the SOW requirement for Help Desk coverage as outlined in section 3.2. There were no letters of intent included in the quotation to validate that the proposed employees are committed to the contract. This increases the risk of unsuccessful performance.

Part 2 Section 2.5.2 Lines 281-286 Page 2-10

Deficiency

The offeror currently only has 3 personnel, one of which is the PM that will not be on-site or performing technical duties, that have met the IAM Level I or IAT Level II requirements of the SOW. The offeror states that they will inform the government with the current status within five (5) days and provide a Plan of Action and Milestones (POA&M). This is an unacceptable approach. It would be a great detriment to the project if only 2 of the proposed 6 full-time, on-site employees are 8570 compliant upon contract award, because they would not be able to obtain the accounts and levels of access necessary to perform their jobs. Reference table 2.5.2-1 8570 requirements. The two engineers would not have access to manage any applications or databases and the Junior Information Systems Technician would not be able to create accounts or manage the Active Directory. These are mission critical functions of those positions.

Part 2 Section 2.6.2 Lines 331-369 Page 2-11

Note

The offeror's Senior Systems Engineer does not list any certifications or technical skills relevant to the SOW section 3.2.

Part 2 Section 2.6.3 Lines 373-348 Page 2-14

Significant Weakness

The offeror's Lead Software Engineer (MCATS SME) does not indicate any Oracle experience within the resume, as required in SOW 4.2. Nor is there a separate Oracle DBA identified to perform these duties. The existing MCATS system is ORACLE based. Without this experience they would not be able to manage or maintain the system.

Section 3. Contractor Work Breakdown Structure (CWBS)

The offeror met the requirement by demonstrating that they understand the work requirements within the SOW, and presented a templated plan to address and accomplish development projects and maintenance of applications.

Factor 3: Past Performance

Past Performance Relevancy Rating: Relevant

Past Performance Confidence Rating: Satisfactory Confidence

Past Performance Summary

The offeror presented recent past performance on other contracts that was relevant to the requirements of the SOW. The examples provided are Relevant to IT FSS requirement because they involve similar product integration, and efforts of similar size, scope and complexity, and were performed for municipal, state, and federal government public safety organizations.

The aggregate past performance provides limited confidence that they will be able to provide program management, engineering, SharePoint, Lotus Notes, and ORACLE application support to integrate their platform as part of the overall solution.

Section 1. Recent and Relevant Past Performance

Contract# W91QUZ07D0001

The Offeror provided a past performance example of the work they performed for the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command's (SDDC) Consolidated Web Capabilities (CWC) program which encompassed the consolidation of several legacy, web-based systems and interfaces into a common environment. Harris's developers create new processes and maintain existing features of SDDC's SharePoint portal; the portal provides a means to distribute Command Information across SDDC, provide collaboration and staffing tools, and to share information with commercial partners and the public. CWC applications are maintained as the functionality is consolidated in the SharePoint Portal and public-facing website. The Offeror remains involved in the sustainment of this system. This past performance is relevant because it involves efforts that are of similar scope and complexity as required by the current solicitation.

Contract# W91QUZ-07-D-0001-F708

The Offeror provided Harris provides cradle to grave operations and management support for the Army's flagship website, Army.mil. The Chief, Public Affairs (CPA) is responsible to the Chief of Staff, Army

(CSA) for fulfilling their obligation to keep important and diverse internal and external audiences informed. The Offeror remains involved in the sustainment of this system. This past performance is relevant because it involves efforts that are of similar scope and complexity as required by the current solicitation.

Contract# M67854-08-F-4969

The Offeror provided comprehensive Information Technology (IT) support services to the Marine Corps Systems Command (MCSC) Office of the Command Information Officer (OCIO). This example included continuing technical support, management, and oversight of MCSC IT operations required to maintain operational levels and service to the USMC's primary acquisition activity. These services include: Program Management; SharePoint and Web Service Application Development and Implementation; Systems Management and Administration; Tier 1, 2, and 3 Service Desk, Desktop Customer Support, and VIP Support; Database Administration; NMCI Support; Network Engineering and Support; Asset Management and Support; Strategic Analysis; VTC and other A/V services; and IA support. The Offeror remains involved in the sustainment of this system. This past performance is relevant because it involves efforts that are of similar scope and complexity as required by the current solicitation. Section 2. Customer Assessment

After reviewing the customer past performance questionnaire from Jonathan Markol, MCSC CIO, and Renee Brokering, Contracting Officer Representative, all evaluation ratings were checked as excellent or satisfactory with no derogatory comments noted in the remarks.

Contract# W91QUZ07D0001

Based on the questionnaire, their effort has been exemplary and with limited incidents and was performed within the award price of the contract. Based on the example, the SSEB has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror can perform the work described in the PWS.

Contract# W91QUZ-07-D-0001-F708

Based on the questionnaire, their effort has been exemplary and with limited incidents and was performed within the award price of the contract. Based on the example, the SSEB has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror can perform the work described in the SOW.

Contract# M67854-08-F-4969

Based on the questionnaire, their effort has been exemplary and with limited incidents and was performed within the award price of the contract. Based on the example, the SSEB has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror can perform the work described in the PWS